

REMARKSClaim Objections

Claim 2 stands objected to by the Examiner because the claim does not end with a period “.”. Claim 2 has been amended so as to end with a period. Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 2 is currently in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by Mehrotra et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,163,021).

Directing Examiner’s attention to MPEP 2131, the threshold issue under Section 102 is whether the Examiner has established a *prima facie* case for anticipation. “A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ 2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987)”. “The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ...claim.” *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Claim 1

Claim 1 recites a configurable mirror sense amplifier system comprising “a power source generating a reference voltage; and an array wherein the array comprises a first plurality of transistors and a means for selecting, each of the first plurality of transistors coupled to the means for selecting, the array biased at the reference voltage and configured to provide a current for comparison with the flash memory; wherein said

array is configured to read said reference voltage immediately when said reference voltage is stable.”

Mehrotra does not teach an array comprising a first plurality of transistors wherein the array is configured to read the reference voltage immediately when the reference voltage signal is stable. Instead, Mehrotra describes the use of a *flash reference cell* for providing a current for comparison. Mehrotra states, “programming voltages or erasing voltages are selectively supplied each reference cell such as cell 400 ... it then serves as a reference for the reading of an addressed memory cell such as cell 420.” (Col. 11, lines 24-38). It describes the reference cells as “being an identical device as that of the memory cells” (Col. 2, line 68; Col. 3, line 1). Since the memory cells are part of the Flash EEprom system in Mehrotra, it is clear that Mehrotra uses flash reference cells to read the reference voltage signals.

As would be appreciated by one with ordinary skill in the art, the array comprising the plurality of transistors in Claim 1 of the present invention ultimately is faster than the flash reference cell in Mehrotra. The reference cell in Mehrotra, requires a waiting period for the reference cell current to turn on in order to read or program.

In contrast, the use of the array comprising a plurality of transistors, as in Claim 1 of the present invention, allows the reference voltage signals to be ready at the beginning and capable of being read immediately.

Examiner also asserts that Claim 1 of the present invention is anticipated by the Applicant Admitted Prior Art figure 1. However, as in Mehrotra, Prior Art figure 1 clearly teaches the use of a reference cell, which is incapable of reading the reference voltage signal immediately without being turned on.

Applicant respectfully submits that neither Mehrotra nor Prior Art figure 1 teach each and every element of Claim 1 of the present invention. Therefore, Claim 1 is

currently in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-12

Since Claims 2-12 are dependent from Claim 1, they are also patentable as they contain the same limitations as Claim 1. Therefore, Claims 2-12 are currently in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 13

The same arguments made above with respect to the patentability of Claim 1 are applicable to the patentability of Claim 13 as well. Therefore, Claim 13 is currently in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 14-16

Since Claims 14-16 are dependent from Claim 13, they are also patentable as they contain the same limitations as Claim 13. Therefore, Claims 14-16 are currently in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 17-19

The same arguments made above with respect to the patentability of Claim 1 are applicable to the patentability of Claims 17-19 as well. Therefore, Claims 17-19 are

currently in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner has any questions regarding this application, the Examiner may telephone the undersigned at 775-586-9500.

Respectfully submitted,
SIERRA PATENT GROUP, LTD.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Kenneth D'Alessandro', written over the printed name.

Kenneth D'Alessandro
Reg. No.: 29,144

Dated: October 29, 2004

Sierra Patent Group, Ltd.
P.O. Box 6149
Stateline, NV 89449
(775) 586-9500
(775) 586-9550 Fax